DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 044 HE 015 322

AUTHOR Johnson, John A.
TITLE A Profile of Faculty of Doctoral Programs in the Study of Higher Education in the United States. ASHE Annual Meeting 1982 Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 2-3, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Curriculum Evaluation; *Doctoral Programs; Educational Background; Evaluation Criteria; Full Time Faculty; *Higher Education; Individual Characteristics; Males; *Postsecondary Education As a Field of Study; Program Evaluation; Publications; Research Projects; Scholarship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Qualifications; *Teaching Experience; Whites; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Faculty Publishing

ABSTRACT

Selected findings are presented of a study designed to identify the personal characteristics, educational background, work experience, and career patterns of the faculty of doctoral programs in the study of higher education. Attention is also directed to their perceptions of various elements relevant to the study of higher education, including the most important faculty qualifications, the most important criteria in evaluating these doctoral programs, and the most outstanding programs. The schools offer a Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degree with higher education as a field of study, and each faculty member spends one-half or more of his or her effort with the doctoral program, including teaching and supervising doctoral students. For sixty-five institutions, 200 faculty members responded to a questionnaire in 1978. Among the characteristics of the typical faculty member are the following: male Caucasian who is 48.5 years old, tenured, full professor who is employed full-time in the doctoral program; teaches 6 or more equivalent semester hours of courses per term and assists 18.8 advisees; has been employed at 3.2 postsecondary institutions and has 8.3 years of administrative experience and 10.3 years of teaching experience; has published no books, one or two monographs, and 5 to 10 articles related to higher education; considers knowledge of the field and teaching competence to be the most important qualifications for himself and his colleagues; considers research competence to be an important qualification, but less important than the other two; and in assessing the quality of doctoral programs in the study of higher education, perceives the teaching expertise of faculty and the research and publications of faculty to be the most important criteria. (SW)

ED219044

A PROFILE OF FACULTY OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

by

JOHN A. JOHNSON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John A. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A report presented to national conference participants of the Association for the Study of Higher Education

Washington, D.C.

March 2, 1982

HE015 322

Association for the Study of Higher Education

The George Washington University / One Dupont Circle, Suite 630 / Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C. March 2-3, 1982. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Annual Meeting — March 2-3, 1982 — Washington Hilton
Washington, D.C

A PROFILE OF FACULTY OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The purpose of this paper is to present selected findings of a study designed to identify the personal characteristics, educational backgrounds, work experience, and career patterns of the faculty of doctoral programs in the study of higher education. The study also sought their perceptions of various elements relevant to the study of higher education, including the most important faculty qualifications, the most important criteria in evaluating these doctoral programs, and the most outstanding programs.

The potential institutional population for the study was identified as the composite of program listings in Dressel and Mayhew's (1974) Higher Education as a Field of Study and the 1977-78 Directory of Higher Education Programs and Faculty which was compiled by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. From a 100 percent mail response, 70 institutions were identified as offering a program which met the following definition:

> A course of study leading to a Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degree with a major or general emphasis in higher education as a field of study and which is designed to prepare leadership personnel for higher education institu-

> tions and related agencies. This excludes programs designed exclusively to prepare college teachers.

These 70 institutions reported 271 faculty members who met the following definition:

> Those persons supplying one-half or more of their total effort to the doctoral program in the study of higher education. This effort must include both teaching in the program and supervising doctoral students.

The study was limited to these individuals in order to focus upon those professionals who form the core of the programs and who are dedicated to and most involved in the study of higher education.

The respondents to the faculty inventory which was distributed and returned during Spring 1978 were 200 (73.8%) faculty members of doctoral programs in the study of higher education representing 65 of the 70 identified institutions offering such programs. Thirty-six of the 70 institutions achieved 100 percent responses from their identified faculty.

The brevity of this presentation prohibits a comprehensive presentation of the numerous frequency or central tendency descriptors of 200 faculty members. Therefore, I have taken the liberty of utilizing these descriptors to construct the hypothetical, "typical" faculty member of a doctoral program in the study of higher education.

This "typical" faculty member is a male Caucasian who

is 48.5 years old. He is a tenured, full professor and is employed full-time in the doctoral program. His first emphasis in his work is placed on teaching (including preparation and grading) his six or more equivalent semester hours of courses per term. He spends his next greatest amount of time assisting his 18.8 advisees followed by the time required in chairing 3.5 dissertation committees and serving on 6.4 others.

Although he expects to continue working in his present higher education program, he has been employed at 3.2 post-secondary institutions and has 8.3 years of administrative experience and 10.3 years of teaching experience. He left an administrative position in a postsecondary institution in 1970 to assume his present position.

After completing a noneducation baccalaureate major, this "typical" faculty member completed master's and doctoral degrees with majors in education. He completed his Doctor of Philosophy degree in 1964 with a doctoral major or minor which was directly related to the study of higher education.

He has published no books, one or two monographs, and five to ten articles related to higher education. Possibly as a result of this moderate production, he feels relatively less adequate in his work regarding his research and publication record than regarding his educational background or his work experience.

This "typical" faculty member has a slightly greater

orientation toward teaching and scholarship in higher education than toward his institution. He feels that the doctoral program in which he is employed is better than average and that the future of doctoral programs in the study of higher education will be slightly brighter than their present status. He experiences a high degree of satisfaction in his work.

Knowledge of the field and teaching competence are considered by him to be the most important qualifications for himself and his colleagues. He considers research competence to be an important qualification, but less important than the other two.

In assessing the quality of doctoral programs in the study of higher education, he perceives the teaching expertise of faculty and the research and publication of faculty to be the most important criteria. Using these criteria as a basis for judgment, he feels that the University of Michigan has the most outstanding doctoral program in the study of higher education in the United States.

This "typical" faculty member may not represent any single individual. However, this hypothetical person is representative of the faculty of doctoral programs in the study of higher education.

While this construct or "thumbnail sketch" and the attached tables may serve best to stimulate further interest,

those who are sufficiently stimulated to seek a more comprehensive presentation and analysis of this information may request the monograph by the same title by contacting:

Dr. Thomas Diener, Director
Institute of Higher Education
P. O. Box 6293
The University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486
(205) 348-7770

Table 1

Institutional and Individual Population and Sample

Institutions Which Comply	Individuals Identified	Respondents	Institutions Which Comply	Individuals Identified	Respondents
University of Alabama	5	5	East Texas State University	4	3
University of Arizona	7	6	University of Florida	4	4
Arizona State University	3	3	Florida State University	8	6
University of Arkansas	3	3	George Washington University	4	3
Auburn University	4	4	University of Georgia	6	6
Boston College	3	2	University of Illinois	2	2
Boston University	2	2	Indiana University	8	8
University of California (Los Angeles)	9	8	University of Iowa	3	1
University of Chicago	2	1	Iowa State University	3	3
Claremont Graduate School	2	2	University of Kansas	3	2
University of Connecticut	7	6	University of Kentucky	3	3
Duke University	3	2	Loyola University	5	5

Table 1--Continued

Institutions Which Comply	Individuals Identified	Respondents
University of Maine	2	2
University of Maryland	2	2
University of Massachusetts	5	4
Memphis State University	3	3
University of Miami (Florida)	2	1
University of Michigan	6	6
Michigan State University	10	6
University of Minnesota	6	4
University of Mississippi	3	2
University of Missouri	3	3
SUNY--Albany	7	4
SUNY--Buffalo	6	6
New York University	3	3
University of North Carolina	3	3
North Texas State University	9	5
Ohio State University	5	4
University of Oklahoma	2	2
Oklahoma State University	7	3
University of Oregon	1	1
Peabody College for Teachers	2	1
University of Pennsylvania	7	4
Pennsylvania State University	2	2
University of Pittsburgh	5	4
St. Louis University	2	2
University of South Carolina	3	3
Southern Illinois University	9	5

Table 1--Continued

Institutions Which Comply	Individuals Identified	Respondents
University of Southern Mississippi	1	1
Stanford University	1	1
Syracuse University	3	2
University of Texas (Austin)	6	5
Texas A & M University	2	2
Texas Tech University	2	2
University of Toledo	3	2
University of Virginia	9	8
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	8	8
University of Washington	6	6
Washington State University	2	2
Wayne State University	2	2
West Virginia University	2	2
College of William and Mary	2	2
University of Wisconsin	4	3
University of California (Berkeley)	5	0
Columbia University (Teachers College)	7	0
University of Houston	3	0
University of Southern California	4	0
Western Michigan University	1	0
Subtotals: (70 Institutions)	291	223
Respondents who did not Comply	20	20
Responses not useable		3
Totals:	271	200

Table 2

Academic Rank and Tenure Status of Faculty of

Higher Education Doctoral Programs

	Total Number Involved	Tenured		Tenure Track		Nontenure Track	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Professors	112	106	53.0	5	2.5	1	0.5
Associate Professors	57	42	21.0	15	7.5	0	0.0
Assistant Professors	26	1	0.5	24	12.0	1	0.5
Instructors	2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.0
Lecturers	3	0	0.0	1	0.5	2	1.0
Total	200	149	74.5	45	22.5	6	3.0

Table 3

Major of Doctoral Degree

Major	Number	Percent
Education		
Higher Education	65	32.5
Community College	7	3.5
Student Personnel	7	3.5
Adult/Continuing Education	7	3.5
Research, Evaluation, and Measurement	3	1.5
Curriculum and Instruction	4	2.0
Educational Administration	45	22.5
Counselor Education	17	8.5
Educational Psychology	5	2.5
Other Education	19	9.5
Letters	0	0.0
Social Sciences	17	8.5
Physical and Biological Sciences	1	0.5
Business and Management	0	0.0
Other	1	0.5
Master's Degree Only	2	1.0
Total	200	100.0%

Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) terminology was used as a framework for devising this table.

Table 4

Highest Levels of Administrative Positions Held

Levels of Positions	Number	Percent
No Administrative Position Held	21	10.5
President or Chancellor	18	9.0
Vice President	15	7.5
Assistant/Associate Vice President	3	1.5
Academic Dean	31	15.5
Other Dean	18	9.0
Assistant/Associate Dean	8	4.0
Department Head or Equivalent	26	13.0
Director	31	15.5
Director, State Coordinating/ Regulatory Board	3	1.5
State Director of Community/ Technical Colleges	5	2.5
Other	21	10.5
Total	200	100.0%

Table 5

Relative Importance of Qualifications for Faculty of Higher Education Doctoral Programs

Qualification	Mean Rank	Rank One		Rank Two		Rank Three		Rank Four		Rank Five		Not Ranked	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Knowledge of the Field	2.2	110	55.0	32	16.0	19	9.5	14	7.0	7	3.5	18	9.0
Teaching Competence	2.5	43	21.5	90	45.0	32	16.0	13	6.5	5	2.5	17	8.5
Research Competence	3.5	17	8.5	38	19.0	52	26.0	40	20.0	21	10.5	32	16.0
Competence in Advising Students	4.2	3	1.5	13	6.5	48	24.0	49	24.5	42	21.0	45	22.5
Publication Record	4.8	9	4.5	5	2.5	17	8.5	39	19.5	42	21.0	88	44.0
Administrative Competence	5.3	4	2.0	7	3.5	9	4.5	16	8.0	30	15.0	134	67.0
Competence in Service/ Consulting	5.3	0	0.0	7	3.5	13	6.5	19	9.5	40	20.0	121	60.5
Other	5.7	7	3.5	1	0.5	3	1.5	2	1.0	1	0.5	186	93.0
No Response		7	3.5	7	3.5	7	3.5	8	4.0	12	6.0		
Total		200	100.0%	200	100.0%	200	100.0%	200	100.0%	200	100.0%		

Table 6

Relative Importance of Criteria in Assessing the Quality of Doctoral Programs in the Study of Higher Education

Criteria	Mean Rank	Rank One		Rank Two		Rank Three		Rank Four		Rank Five		Not Ranked	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Teaching Expertise of Faculty	3.4	56	28.0	33	16.5	22	11.0	14	7.0	15	7.5	60	30.0
Research and Publication of Faculty	3.7	45	22.5	26	13.0	23	11.5	21	10.5	27	13.5	58	29.0
Depth of Course Offerings	4.1	19	9.5	31	15.5	33	16.5	20	10.0	18	9.0	79	39.5
Contribution of Graduates	4.4	31	15.5	16	8.0	15	7.5	25	12.5	14	7.0	99	49.5
Breadth of Course Offerings	4.6	10	5.0	21	10.5	31	15.5	20	10.0	17	8.5	101	50.5
Placement of Graduates	5.0	4	2.0	17	8.5	17	8.5	21	10.5	26	13.0	115	57.5
Stringency of Admission Requirements	5.2	7	3.5	10	5.0	14	7.0	16	8.0	13	6.5	140	70.0
Number of Full-Time Faculty	5.2	4	2.0	15	7.5	15	7.5	14	7.0	13	6.5	139	69.5
Requirement of Internship	5.5	3	1.5	8	4.0	5	2.5	8	4.0	14	7.0	162	81.0
Size of Geographical Orientation(e.g. local vs. national)	5.5	3	1.5	7	3.5	7	3.5	13	6.5	7	3.5	163	81.5
Number of Graduates	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.5	6	3.0	9	4.5	182	91.0
Other	5.4	10	5.0	8	4.0	6	3.0	8	4.0	6	3.0	162	81.0
No Response		8	4.0	8	4.0	9	4.5	14	7.0	21	10.5		
Total		200	100.0%	200	100.0%	200	100.0%	200	100.0%	200	100.0%		

Table 7

Ranking* of the Ten Most Outstanding Doctoral Programs in the Study of Higher Education

Institutions	Mean Rank	Rank One		Rank Two		Rank Three		Rank Four		Rank Five		Not Ranked	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
University of Michigan	2.9	50	34.7	33	22.9	15	10.4	7	4.9	6	4.2	33	22.9
University of California at Los Angeles	4.3	15	10.4	21	14.6	18	12.5	13	9.0	6	4.2	71	49.3
University of California at Berkeley	4.4	16	11.1	16	11.1	18	12.5	11	7.6	11	7.6	72	50.0
Pennsylvania State University	4.8	4	2.8	17	11.8	20	13.9	10	6.9	12	8.3	81	56.3
Stanford University	4.8	19	13.2	9	6.3	8	5.6	7	4.9	4	2.8	97	67.4
University of Texas	5.3	11	7.6	4	2.8	7	4.9	5	3.5	4	2.8	113	78.5
Michigan State University	5.4	6	4.2	3	2.1	9	6.3	5	3.5	3	2.1	118	81 9
State University of New York at Buffalo	5.5	1	0.7	3	2.1	9	6.3	10	6.9	7	4.9	114	79.2
Florida State University	5.5	2	1.4	4	2.8	5	3.5	10	6.9	8	5.6	115	79.9
Columbia University Teachers College	5.5	3	2.1	7	4.9	3	2.1	5	3.5	4	2.8	122	84.7

*Complete or Partial Rankings Were Provided by 144 Respondents.